

REMARKS

Status of the Application

Prior to this amendment, claims 1 and 4-27 were pending. Claims 1, 19 and 22 have been amended. Claims 2 and 3 were previously canceled, and claims 25 and 26 have now been canceled. No claims have been added. Therefore, claims 1, 4-24 and 27 remain pending for examination. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended and in light of the remarks herein.

The Office Action rejected claims 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by the cited portions of U.S. Patent No. 7,092,044 to Inui et al. ("Inui").

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 4-5, 8, 11-14, 18, 22 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Inui in view of the cited portions of U.S. Patent 5,200,823 to Yoneda ("Yoneda").

The Office Action rejected claims 6-7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Inui in view of Yoneda and further in view of the cited portions of U.K. Patent Application GB 2,348,330 to Kim ("Kim").

The Office Action rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Inui in view of Yoneda, and further in view of the cited portions of U.S. Patent 5,574,495 to Caporizzo ("Caporizzo").

The Office Action rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Inui in view of Yoneda, and further in view of the cited portions of U.S. Patent 6,067,332 to Taura et al. ("Taura").

The Office Action rejected claims 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Inui in view of Yoneda and further in view of the cited portions of U.S. Patent 6,137,546 to Shintani et al. (“Shintani”).

The Office Action rejected claims 17 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Inui in view of Yoneda, and further in view of the cited portions of U.S. Patent 5,966,186 to Shigihara et al. (“Shigihara”).

The Office Action rejected claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Inui in view of Yoneda, and further in view of the cited portions of U.S. Patent Publication 2002/0140871 to Piotrowski et al. (“Piotrowski”).

Amendments

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to clarify the scope of the embodiments claimed therein. This amendment is supported throughout the specification, and particularly at figure 4 and the explanation thereof in the specification. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is added by this amendment.

Claim 19

Claim 19 has been amended to clarify the scope of the embodiments claimed therein. This amendment is supported throughout the specification, and particularly at figure 5 and the explanation thereof in the specification. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is added by this amendment.

Claim 22

Claim 22 has been amended to clarify the scope of the embodiments claimed therein. This amendment is supported throughout the specification, and particularly at figure 4 and the explanation thereof in the specification. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is added by this amendment.

Remarks

Claims 1, 19 and 22

The Office Action rejected claims 1 and 22 as being obvious over Inui in view of Yoneda. The Office Action rejected claim 19 as being anticipated by Inui.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 19 and 22 to clarify the scope of the embodiments claimed therein. Specifically, claims 1 and 22 have been amended to include a memory unit which stores flags identifying whether a physical channel is judged to include digital broadcasting signal and whether VCT information in that signal can or cannot be extracted. Likewise, claim 19 has been amended to recite channel information containing similar indicative data. Claims 1 and 22 have also been amended to include storing a physical channel number in tandem with a virtual channel number. Claim 19 has also been amended to include storing channel number in tandem with scan-ability.

Inui and Yoneda do not teach or suggest the above recitations. Therefore, Inui and Yoneda cannot anticipate or render obvious claims 1, 19 and 22. Consequently, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §102 and §103 rejections of these claims.

Claims 4-18, 20, 21, 23, 24 and 27

Claims 4-18, 20, 21, 23, 24 and 27 each depend, either directly or indirectly, from one of claims 1, 19 or 22, and are therefore believed to be allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from an allowable base claim. Consequently, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the §102 and §103 rejections of these claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/626,047
Amdt. dated August 19, 2008
Amendment under 37 CFR 1.116 Expedited Procedure
Examining Group 2623

PATENT

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,



Matthew T. Sarles
Reg. No. 58,696

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
MTS:cmb
61439239 v1